

Serial No. 10/726,649

Docket No. IPS-0016

Amdt. dated October 26, 2007

Reply to Office Action of May 15, 2007

Amendments to the Drawings

Replacement Sheets have been submitted to include a legend in Figures 2-5.

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20 are pending. Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20 have been amended, claims 7 and 17 have been canceled, and new claims 21-36 have been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification. In addition, the specification has been amended to correct typographical errors, and a new title has been provided which is more descriptive of the invention as claimed.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

I. The Drawing Objections

In the Office Action, the drawings were found to be objectionable on two grounds: (1) Figures 2-5 fail to include an appropriate legend and (2) the drawings fail to show the features of a DVI decoder for receiving and decoding DVI video data “to apply the decoded data to the output signal selector” as recited in claim 7, and an output signal selector which selects “the digital video data outputted from the switching unit . . . converting units” as recited in claim 1.

To overcome these objections, Replacement Sheets have been submitted to include the legend “Related Art” in Figures 2-5. Also, claim 7 has been canceled and claim 12 has been amended to recite that the output signal selector performs the function of “selecting any one of digital video data outputted from the scaler, the digital video data outputted from one of the first data converters, or the digital video data outputted from one of the second data converters.” These features are shown in Figure 6 and disclosed, for example, at Paragraph [42] of the specification.

Moreover, Applicants note that the subject matter of now-canceled claim 7 has been incorporated into claim 1 in a manner which avoids the drawing objection, e.g., amended claim 1 recites “a digital visual interface (DVI) decoder for receiving and decoding DVI video data output from the encoder.” See Figure 6 and corresponding portions of the specification for support.

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments and remarks are sufficient to overcome the drawing objections.

II. The Claim Objections

Claims 5 and 18 were found to be objectionable for containing typographical errors. Claim 5 has been amended to replace “video decoder” with “component processor,” and claim 18 has been amended to replace “signal” with “signals.” Applicants submit that these amendments are sufficient to overcome the drawing objections. It is further noted that additional amendments have been made to the claims to improve antecedent basis for various terms and for general clarity.

III. The Rejection under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected on grounds that the specification fails to enable the function of the output selector. Claim 12 has been amended to recite that the output selector performs the function of “selecting any one of digital video data outputted from the scaler, the digital video data outputted from one of the first data converters, or the digital video data outputted from one of the second data converters.”

For support, see, for example, the non-limiting embodiment of Figure 6 which shows that output signal selector 426 selects one of the following five inputs: digital video data output from scaler 422, digital video data output from the 2nd A/D converter 412, digital video data output from 1st converter 410, digital video data output from component processor 402, and the digital video data output from video decoder 400. Paragraph [42] of the specification also describes these features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments to claim 12 are sufficient to overcome the § 112, first paragraph, rejection.

IV. The Rejections under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 14, 15, 17, and 18 were rejected for being anticipated by each of the Reimers and Vaughan patents. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the subject matter of allowance claim 7. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 3-5 and 8 have been rewritten into independent form. The Examiner indicated that these amendments would be sufficient to place claims 3-5, 8, and their dependent claims into condition for allowance.

The Reimers patent discloses a switch 4 which the Examiner indicated performs step b) of claim 14. This step requires “digital visual interface (DVI)-encoding” one of the selected digital video data signals generated in step a). The Reimers patent does not disclose these features. As shown in the sole figure in the patent, switch 4 receives two digital signals, one from A/D converter 13 and one from A/D converter 14. These signals are then output to auto-timing unit 21 and picture

memory 22, neither of which performs DVI encoding. Thus, Reimers does not disclose the decoding step of claim 14.

Moreover, step b) recites “selecting one of the digital video data signals based on whether a predetermined input terminal of the display appliance has received one of said video signals.” (See, for example, Paragraph [38] of the specification for support, where the first selection signal is generated to have a first value if input terminal of converter 412 receives an analog signal and is generated to have a second value if this input terminal does not receive an analog signal.)

The Reimers patent does not disclose that switch 4 selects one of the digital signals output from A/D converters 13 and 14 based on whether an input terminal of a specific data converter receives a signal or not.

Absent these disclosures, it is submitted that the Reimers patent does not anticipate claim 14 or any of its dependent claims.

The Vaughan patent discloses a circuit 38 which converts analog video signals from a plurality sources into a digital signals. One of the signals is then selected for conversion into DVI format. However, circuit 38 does not select a digital video data signal based on whether a predetermined input terminal of the display appliance has received an analog video signal, i.e., Vaughan does not disclose “selecting one of the digital video data signals based on whether a predetermined input terminal of the display appliance has received one of said video signals.”

Absent these disclosures, it is submitted that the Vaughan patent does not anticipate claim 14 or any of its dependent claims.

V. The Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

Applicants traverse these rejections on grounds that AAPA does not teach or suggest the features of claim 14 missing from the Reimers and Vaughan patents.

VI. New Claims

New claims 21-36 have been added to the application.

Claim 23 recites “a detector to detect whether a predetermined input terminal of the apparatus has received one of said analog video signals” and “a first selector to select one of the digital video data signals based on a first selection signal from the detector.” An encoder then encodes the selected digital video data signal to generate video data in a predetermined format. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 24 recites that “the first selector selects one of the digital video data signals based on the first selection signal and a second selection signal, the second selection signal corresponding to one of the digital video signals output from the converters.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 25 recites that “the first selector selects one of the digital video data signals based on the first selection signal, a second selection signal, and a user enable signal.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 26 recites the additional feature of “a second selector to select one of the digital video data signals for processing,” and that “the first selector selects one of the digital video data signals or

the processed digital video data signal based on the first selection signal.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 27 recites that “the first selector selects one of the digital video data signals or the processed digital video signal based on based on the first selection signal and a second selection signal, the second selection signal corresponding to one of the digital video signals output from the converters.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 28 recites that “the first selector selects one of the digital video data signals based on the first selection signal, a second selection signal, and a user enable signal.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 30 recites that said predetermined format is a digital visual interface (DVI) format. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 31 recites “a decoder for decoding the digital video signal output from the encoder for display.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 32 recites “a second selector to select a signal output of the decoder or a digital video signal output from one of the converters based on the first selection signal, the signal selected by the second selector being processed for display.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 33 recites that “said predetermined format is a digital visual interface (DVI) format and the decoder is a digital visual interface (DVI) decoder.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 34 recites that “at least one of the converters includes: a video decoder to decode a TV signal, and a color coordinate transformer to transform an output of the video decoder for input into the first selector.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 35 recites that “one of the converters includes a component processor for processing a DVD signal corresponding to one of the analog video signals.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 36 recites that “one of the converters includes: a component processor to process a DVD signal corresponding to one of the analog video signals, and a color coordinate transformer to transform an output of the component processor into digital RGB data for input into the first selector.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application are respectfully requested.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and

Serial No. 10/726,649
Amdt. dated October 26, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 15, 2007

Docket No. IPS-0016

future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw
Date: October 26, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610